Rear Paul,

Your very interesting letter of 8/6 reises a number of things of inter st and some that are feedback of my own, uncredited work used by

Most of all, at the moment, I am quite interested in what CBS attributed to Alvarez but which, in its entirety, not just the Frame 190 staff, it knew about earlier from me. I t was determined not to credit me. I can prove they had my stuff and that they knew this was in it, for they credited one part of "one critic". I may be wanting to do something about CBS, hence everything on, about or from Alvarez, who I presume to be honorable, is of great interest and I'd like all of it, even if inaccurate.

Hel is right. Add to that that I am much more tired then ever. So I will not take time to search out references. My guess is that the second "alvarez" camera shake T go into et severel points in WWII, beginning about pp 212-3 and about six of seven pages later. The 227 is specific. Ray argued the meaning of it with me. I think he says Commelly was hit there. Alvarez failed to note 222, there it is siso true. The interesting thing, as CBS has not responded about, is that there are about a half-dozen such points, not just the three Alvarez talks about. I have other unpublished material on this I'd prefer not.

show to go into here. It is something with it soon, a sound, etc., could have to to the propositing of Frames 1856 is not all varieza but mine (WW48), I think it is likely there could have been an even earlier Esprider resction of If you can supply it, it dispreciate e clearer copy of your mote so I cen send them to someone who is interested the shield who thinks he may be able to do something for me about it shots, the background blurring is differ no that of Town all this as fast sas possible; for I would like this as fast sas possible.

a CBS vice president. Also, I went to make the only outgoing mail, leaving in a few minutes. It and see a extension of the observation (Mintewall, 1998)

I am quite interested in any alteration or anything unusual et about frame 285. There is a sharp to ward view motion about there are that I slone seem to have discovered. You will inhadthe of mention provessely in The red no one would believe so violent with settlement with the conficial interpretation of the film, son just where red blication I went over the instant weekened this point to heve to say merely that the meed sudves ein both directions in disconnected motions. The lifet the short Behappend forward; the to the second (313) Wiolently backwerd. Indirestly like actor what bliverezhes. The posence of a single frame here could be crucial erremension, theatlifes is estill mislabel fed even whough to called the ordicial attention class year. of chock waves, and the Monerch Cooks is of great interest. Caneyou.get me a copy or lend me

yours? I can't speak for the cops or Wuiroge, although i imagine the cops thought cesti awald what they call "Red". But Bringuier is pure hut a the only thing ours to speak for the cops thought captured the caps against me was tossed out of court a week age today. He elleged my correct quotetion of his own testimony defamed nime he is right of radical right, whose to argie. If you can spare a copy of that samparts piece.
(I tild like it. I do not know if I have it or not, but ind like a second if I do;
the faces of that stuff was nine, some given them in confidence in December and some the consequence of Bill and Laggie calling Turner in when I asked them to follow one of my leads. They wanted professional help, Turner kept all of its not even telling me what he learned! That is the "inuteman, Gabaldon stuff. The guy we took hento phoned me from 'slif. and I referred to Bill. I believe Wanister was Sher is "mother hen", very similar to the Ramparts "babysitter".... True about Novel on NBC payroll 2/1. NYTimes had man down there at latest in November. Inv estigation began 10/66. I knew about it 1/1. Te has gone back ton. N.O. I gether from Alcock he'll sing... If Bringuier is a nut, the others need not be.